You can mix and match CBR and UBR on the same loop. Right now the maximum capabilities we have are looking to expand them but are one CBR and one UBR on a loop. That's the maximum capability, or you can have one of each or either one. We would be interested in getting feedback about if you see needs for, you know, more PVCs on the same loop of a UBR variety or more of CBR PVC, if there's -- what type of business needs you guys have out there. Different types of equipment we have have different capabilities and our vendors have been asking for different sorts of input as far as how we'd like to do it. So we need to get some input from you guys on that.

Admission control prevents bandwidth oversubscription. It's an important piece here. You guys have heard us say numerous times that our biggest concern about CBR is the impact on the capacity available to the network. What CBR requires you to put in place is something called a connection admission control algorithm, a CAC, C-A-C. A CAC alg it's called. A CAC algorithm is invoked at the provision -- at the time of provision and it basically goes into the network element and says I have request for a new service, is there enough capacity on that network element to support this additional service and on a service order by service order basis and sends a response back up to our provisions systems to tell it whether that capability -- that

capacity is there.

If a service would -- if one more customer gets provision and would violate the connection admission control algorithm, that service order will be rejected. And I'll talk a little bit more about that later. What that allows you to do is provision too much CBR, it starts to affect the quality of service of others, other customers on the network, potentially other CBR customers and certainly other UBR customers. And finally -- so admission control takes place during the provision when I first turn on a service.

Policing, what I mentioned before, takes place after the service has been established but while I'm sending the traffic to make sure that the traffic conforms to the parameters that we've set up.

This a little information about some of the capacity management concerns that we've got. This is a pretty high level view of the ATM pieces of the network. We have the OCD and fiber OC-3cs linking it to the RTs. And the number of users that we can support on this network is a function of a lot of things. There a lot of different capacity concerns that we have here. It's dependent on the distribution of the DSL line rates.

Very common speed offering is 1.5 megabits per second downstream and something lesser, 120 to three,

four, somewhere in that range upstream but there's a whole wide range of speeds down, some customers as low as 128 or lower kilobits per second downstream up to, you know, six megs upstream. We have a whole range across the network.

So the bandwidth of that -- of the UBR of the DSL streams, the amount of UBR traffic sent and the amount of the CBR traffic that's been provisioned on the network, the busy hour load of that CBR traffic and the overbooking ratios for UBR, CBR has a guaranteed place on the network pipe in order to guarantee that speed. UBR provides overbooking so you oversubscribe the same data and to more than one customer but not everybody is going to be transmitting at the same time. Since it's nonguaranteed, that's allowed by the traffic specifications and generally ends up working just fine. But you can specify how much do I overbook that -- how much do I oversubscribe that capacity, so that's another factor.

But we have capacity management concerns in the OCDs in terms of the number of virtual circuits that we can manage there. That's something that we're monitoring and that we're in control of. Bandwidth on the OC-3 between the RT and the OCD, that's also our concern and we have to monitor that to make sure the aggregate bandwidth on there doesn't exceed the OC-3 capacity that we have. If it does exceed it, then we need to modify the network in order to support that. And then there are also limitations in the RTs

in terms of the number of cards that it can support and the number of virtual circuit connections they can provide there.

This is a little picture that shows what CBR does to a network. And so I've got this diagram at the bottom, the total type of that band down there represents the total bandwidth, for instance, of our network of the OC-3c type. And at the beginning, so towards the left side here, I have a hundred UBR customers represented by the bandwidth in the green up at the top and I have 20 CBR customers represented taking up the bandwidth at the bottom.

Now, really the way this works is the 20 CBR customers at the bottom, they get provision and guaranteed that little chunk at the bottom there. The UBR customers get whatever's left. So the hundred UBR customers get whatever's left. They're not guaranteed a slice. They're guaranteed whatever's left. So if I add CBR customers to the network, as I move to the right of this graph here, as I add customers to the network, now I have 25 CBR customers. As I add those five more CBR customers, the hundred UBR customers I had before still have access to whatever's left; however, now there's less left because the CBR customers are guaranteed a larger chunk of that bandwidth.

This is the capacity concern that we have is that even though UBR customers and the quality that we're providing -- quality of service that we're providing the UBR

customers today, even though it's unguaranteed, we still feel an obligation to provide a pretty good level of service or else nobody's going to pay for DSL.

But you can see that as we add -- and if we added in an uncontrolled fashion more and more CBRs to the network, more and more guaranteed services to the network at higher and higher speeds, it starts to impact the quality of service received by those UBR customers because they're constrained to a smaller and smaller piece of the leftover bandwidth.

Let me talk a little bit now about ordering this. Now, some of these things are being worked out right now. The data that's required for ordering some of this and exactly how it's going to appear on the [unintelligible] and things like that is under some revision right now, but this is a pretty good view of what we think it looks like.

So the initial piece CLEC that's -- there's going to be a CLEC responsibility here. We're going to need to provide access to CLECs information about which RTs are CBR capable. Now, initially there's not really new hardware that needs to be deployed in this, but the initial CBR capability's only going to be provided in locations with Litespan digital loop carrier and CBX 500 OCDs. Now, Litespan digital loop carrier is the generally approved digital loop carrier that SBC region as our primary deployment vehicle, but

we have another deployment vehicle I think I've mentioned in the past is AFC, AccessMAX UMC1000, which is in deployment.

The OCDs -- we have other OCDs other than the CBX 500. We also have a Cisco 6400 OCDs. Now, the AFC AccessMAX and the Cisco 6400 don't currently support CBR completely enough for SBC to be able to provision and deploy and maintain that service. We're looking to be able to roll those out in kind of subsequent phases through this certainly before the end of the year, but it depends on some of the development time frames from the vendors. Probably somewhere in the middle of the year we'll have those capabilities available in those other networks.

And this is an important point because currently the Cisco OCD is the only one deployed in the Ameritech five states. So that means that the CBR offering is not initially going to be available in the Ameritech states. It will be fully available throughout the western states, the southwestern states and in the southern.

We have -- so information that we're going to provide to the CLECs will specify RTs that are capable of CBRs so that meet those served by Litespan and then served by an OCD. But also having exceeded their capacity allocation per CDL we're going to limit the amount of capacity that's available for CBR traffic in order to try to minimize the effect on the UBR customers.

Not exactly sure how we're going to provide that information today. We're going to try to provide it through some format that's familiar to you guys. It may be through the existing DTI tool. We haven't completely worked that out yet but want it through some sort of mechanized interface that you guys can access.

On the SBC side, what that's going to allow you to do is before you submit an order, double-check to make sure that RT is capable of providing CBR. What SBC is then going to do is in our order process, as soon as it gets into our system it's going to mechanically check the same thing. We're going to go in and check to see -- make sure that that system is capable of providing CBR as capacity for CBR and will reject the order if it doesn't. And we're going to use the same data source for that checking as will be provided for you guys so you'll have access to the same data that we have for our checking.

Into some of the nitty-gritty here, there's a service order code on the USOC on the LSR today, service order code that specifies the UBR PVC before that element gets translated into a particular USOC. We're going to be adding a new USCP for this CBR. We may have to add two but at least one more USOC in order to specify the CBR permanent virtual circuit that rides across this network.

Now, as I said, you'll still use the same

subloop elements that you're used to ordering today, the same cross connects out in the field. There are the same SAI cross connect portions and the same OCD port and cross connected collocation the same USOCs for that sort of information as you're using today. There aren't any additional physical cross connects associated with this product.

Some of the other information that you're used to providing today, when we place an order you provide -- there's a bid that's referred to as a P-R-O-F, PROF FID. It specifies the line rate, some of the line rate information for the line. That is still used with CBR. It's used for every DSL order. It's important to mention because it's probably the best way to think of that PROF FID really refers to the subloop. It refers to the characteristics of the loop and the card kind of as an aggregate. And as I add additional PVCs, they all have to fit within that complete -- that total aggregate bandwidth that I've allocated using this PROF FID. So that's kind of the overall thing and everything else has to fit inside of it.

Now, then today we're also -- you also provide information on VPI, VCI and provide an A and a Z location, and the locations, I can never remember which is A and Z. The customer end has to be -- has to have a 0/35 specified for the UBR PVC based on the ADSL standards. Now, these -- the existing VPI and VCI values will continue to

be used the exact same way they are today for the UBR portion.

But now if we want a provision CBR we have to add some other information. First of all, we're going to -- we're adding a new information field called PVC typing, which if it's not present, that means that this is a UBR kind of old styled, the current UBR service offering.

Other values that we're allowing with this, the new values we're allowing will be to specify whether I want a CBR only service or if I want a CBR plus UBR service offering, so to specify to our network what type of -- the type of number of PVCs that we want. If we expand service offerings in the future, we may add additional types here.

We have a CBRI, CBR index data field. This is similar to a profile but it's for the CBR stream. It's specifically for the CBR stream. It'll specify the exact values of the parameters that I was mentioning before, peak cell rate, the cell delay, cell transfer delay, cell transfer delay variance and cell loss ratio, the specific characteristics of the incoming traffic for that indicator.

Now, with the profile -- with a PROF FID initially we were allowing CLECs to specify a full range of the bid rates on there. With the CBR information we're going to be specifying an initial index offering for initial service offering and would like -- would appreciate it if you'd again talk to your account representatives if you've got different

needs for different types of profile values than the initial ones offered.

But it works -- it works pretty much just like the existing profile. But, again, this is the profile for the CBR PVC, so I said that has to fit within the constraints of the overall PROF FID. In the final information down here is the CBR VPI and VCI values very similar to the UBR VPI and VCI values. You'll use these for CBR PVCs and this also has a requirement the Z termination customer premise end has to use a value of 0/40 and also conforms to ATM forum standards.

We're going to try to use as much as possible -- reuse as much of the information and capabilities that we have in the broadband service space deployed into two processes. Again, you still have to have an OCD port in place before you can -- so you have to have the infrastructure piece in place before you can place an LSR. You can add -- we're going to make sure that you can take an existing UBR customer and add -- upgrade to add a CBR service to that customer, make sure that that's capable, that that's a capability.

And I have down here loophole system will check the RT status for the CBR availability. That's the system that we're going to use -- we think we're going to use in the order flow right now to access the information on whether an RT is capable of providing CBR. Loophole won't

actually have that information but we'll use it to go out and query another database that we'll use to get that sort of information.

We're looking still to issue the accessible letter. I can't remember -- I don't know if we have actually -- somebody's pulled out a calendar and counted up 180 days and figured out if it's March 8th or March 6th or something like that. We'll issue it on the right date. And -- but individual contracts are going to be required for this service, so we'll have to -- for those who have existing contracts, they'll have to be updated in order to include these new capabilities and readout lists.

This is going to be a somewhat restricted availability. Initially it's going to be offered where we have Litespan NGDLC and Lucent OCDs which is most of the locations in the west and the southwest region and the southern New England region. We are going to limit the fiber feeder capacity for CBR. Our technology resources labs are still analyzing the specific availability of the CBR or the specific requirements of the CBR in order to figure out what that cap is going to be at. Right now we think it might be somewhere in the 20 to 30 percent of that OC-3 range which we think should fully meet the initial CBR demands that we've got.

As we gain more experience with these

capabilities we'll seek input about if we need to raise some of these limitations. We also need to gain more experience with managing just the UBR traffic on the network. And that loophole is going to be used to make sure that we're only offering where we have the technical capability and the capacity.

In the future, these are some of the things that we're evaluating the availability for and we want the feedback on. We're looking into -- with the speed offer as I gave you some of the information about our capacity concerns and where we have capacity concerns and what adding CBR to the network can do, we're concerned about the speed and impact of CBR in existing UBR customers. For those of you who have UBR customers out there I hope would be concerned about that, too.

And what we would like, though, we would like to get input on the speeds. And if you don't want to tell us specific speeds, you can tell us some of the applications, some of the protocols that you'd like to transmit over that ATM offering. That'll give our technology resources folks enough information to try to analyze what some of those requirements would be and what some of the cell transfer delay and delay variance and peak cell rate levels need to be in order to support those different protocols and different thresholds.

Symmetric and asymmetric rates are possible with this capability. If you'd like to -- if we foreseen most of the need would be in terms of symmetric rates. If there's a desire for asymmetric services we'd be interested in finding out about that also. We really need to verify our capacity management systems. We are building some systems to give us updates on the capacity the OCD and the OC-3 ports to make sure that we can trend the exhaust and so we know -- we know if we have limitations in the network.

Those systems aren't done yet and we're still developing the engineering methods, the better engineers will use in order to track those. And as we gain experience with that, we're going to be able to -- we'll be evaluating increasing the speeds of these -- of this service based on the input that you guys provide to us. I mentioned before more PVCs. We can potentially provide the ability to do that. We don't really know what you're interested in. You have different services that you want to provide to customers that aren't -- that require additional UBR PVCs or require additional CBR PVCs and these are things that are kind of [unintelligible] in the past and we'd like to get information -- we'd like to get information about them in our collaboratives through your account manager.

And expanded availability is something that we definitely want to do. As soon as possible we would

want to get this capability on the Cisco OCDs. The Cisco OCD, to get the technical capability to do this, right now it's targeted at the end of April. The switch itself works just fine, actually has the CBR capability today, but their management systems don't have the provisioning interface to allow us provision or maintain or do anything with the CBR PVCs. We need that. That's pretty critical ability for us to be able to manage that capability in the Cisco network. At the end of April we'll get that capability and we're planning -- we want to get it into our TRI labs and test it in outdoor field locations as soon as we can.

And then the AccessMAX actually comes out with that ability sooner. We're expecting the ability on that by the end of first quarter -- first quarter this year. But since the AccessMAX has got a smaller deployment bid, then we think we'll probably have a bigger bank on getting into the Cisco OCD capable first and we're going to try to focus on that first before we come back and get the AccessMAX.

Questions? This again was supposed to be a nice SBC logo. It's a capital A. Any questions?

MS. CARTER: You mentioned the LoopQual system will check RT status for CBR availability. I assume to make that availability in the loop process system happen, you're going to have to go through and populate that information in the system?

MR. WALLACE: The specific flows from system to system up in kind of the beginning of the order flow, I don't exactly know. Things come in through -- they come in through laser. I can't remember all the systems up there, I have to admit. One of them up there -- the information is actually going to be pulled by some tools that we're developing that will query the network elements in realtime and will populate some flat files that will kind of be stored as a database that if it's loophole or another system up there it will then access that database that will be updated on like a daily basis.

MR. BOYER: If I may. This is Chris Boyer with SBC. I think in terms of your question's related to loophole and loophole response. If it has a response, it will tell you whether CBR's available or not. I don't think that's been determined or not. I don't think that the loophole system has been updated to extent that when you initiate a loophole, one of the 35 or so fields you get back will say . . . at the address or not. I'm not sure if they've done that yet

MR. WALLACE: The information that we plan on giving won't be through -- I don't think will be through the loophole tool but will be based on the same information. It'll be accessing the same information.

MS. CARTER: I would like to put this

forth as a request if you would be willing to take it back and consider it. Today many CLECs have an issue with the loop process system either having missing or inaccurate information. And if in fact you are going to go through some sort of process to populate the RT information in that system, I would ask that you also as part of that process look at populating missing data and correcting inaccurate information as long as you're going through that process.

MR. BOYER: Well -- again this is Chris Boyer with SBC and I think the plan -- I think what Matthew was eluding to is how the loophole is today. Today when you issue an order just like with a regular DSL, we use the loophole system not only to provide information to you about what's available, we also edit it against it. So that when an order comes through -- say for instance you did a loop qualification on a given line just in a standard world, not taking CBR. If you did a LoopQual on a given DSL line, our system will edit against that database to determine whether or not that is green, red or yellow, and that's how we know to accept or reject a service order.

I think from that standpoint what Matthew's eluding to is that as we turn up CBR functionality and given RT locations, we're going to use the same process to determine whether we should go ahead and let your order go through or if we should up front reject the order. But I

don't think there's any plan at this point to go through and proactively update all of the information in the loophole database for all. I know there's been a lot of discussion about loophole in various arenas. I don't think there's any plan to correctively update the database as an internal tool.

MS. CARTER: So what you're saying is that you're not going to do some sort of proactive update to populate the remote terminal information in that database including the CBR?

MR. BOYER: I'm not certain yet. I don't think that's been determined yet.

MR. GINDLESBERGER: Larry Gindlesberger from Covad. Matt, quick question. As far as bandwidth restriction speaking about CBR customers versus the UBRs, at this point do you have any plans on limiting the amount of CBR customers that would be in the system? My concern at that point would be we've got UBR customers in there and all of a sudden the bandwidth depletes because of the addition of more than the normal CBR customers.

MR. WALLACE: Yeah. That was -- it was in here somewhere. Yes, we do. Currently we haven't fixed on a specific percentage yet but it will be based on a percentage of the traffic in the OC-3c that goes out from an OCD out to the RT and foresee limiting that to a percentage somewhere in the 20 to 30 percent range. We feel in the analysis we've

done, we feel that we can probably support that much CBR traffic and that allowing 70 to 80 percent of that pipe for UBR still provides -- will still provide adequate capacity for the amount of subscribers. In our deployment of Litespan that, you know, the Litespans can only support so many customers so as we look at how many customers Litespan can support, we think that that 70 to 80 percent of that OC-3c will be able to support the amount of customers that we can get into a Litespan.

Now, if we have, you know, breakthroughs on capacity of Litespan and DSL takes off like crazy, you know, that could be a concern. But in that case we're going to have capacity concerns everywhere in the network and are going to have to look to deploying more OC-3s. But right now 20 to 30 percent is kind of a cap on the amount of CBR that's in terms of bandwidth, not in terms of subscribers. So we'll add up the amount of bandwidth and we will be evaluating that threshold and may move up or down based on the demand of UBR and the demand of CBR.

We also have to -- one of the things that we have to take into account is there are other quality of services out there other than just CBR and UBR. And depending on new services that become available that require some of these other quality services, we may have to carve out another piece of that OC-3 pipe for those other quality services. So

we don't want to give away too much of the OC-3 initially. We want to kind of be conservative of that shared capacity at least until we start getting some customers networking more and more about it. Yes?

MR. NUTTALL: Along that line, I guess --

MR. WALLACE: And your name is?

MR. NUTTALL: Gary Nuttall with Sage. Along that line of CBR capacity, once you get it, does that mean it's going to be first come first serve or are you going to have an ongoing program if there's more capacity needs as you go forward to add capacity for the CBRs? And I guess the other part would be you're putting the letter out in March, so when is the first going to be available and how aggressive is the rollout and what's the whole mechanism to add CBR capability capacity on an ongoing nature as opposed to here it is, that's it, stops?

MR. WALLACE: Let me try to address the second part first. The CBR deployment isn't going to take a new deployment. There's not physical infrastructure or software to deploy. We have to upgrade our -- the OSSs in order to support that. So generally those OSSs are on a regional basis and we'll get the provisioning systems and the support systems upgraded through CBR -- really support CBR with that accessible later offer. So it'll be in the same way as the combined voice and data offering. Once the accessible

letter is put out on any of the Litespan NGDLCs posted by Lucent OCDs CBR service offering will be available.

Now, in terms of the capacity, we haven't answered that question yet for ourself. The 20 to 30 percent cap that we're looking at right now, we've based that on -- based that on some analysis of here's some potential CBR speeds that our customers may need initially, and in the future here's some expected penetrations in terms of relative to, you know, as many of the UBR customers this percentage of them may also be CBR or this percentage may change and become a CBR only offering.

We've been doing some analysis of that and right now we see the 20 to 30 percent of the capacity is going to meet the forecasted needs that we're evaluating. If we see demands on the CBR needs that are different, we may be in a position where we need to reevaluate that threshold. Something that may also change that is if the UBR service, the requirements that we've allocated for the UBR service don't turn out to be as onerous as we need. We've been fairly conservative in our estimate. We don't want to impact that service too much, but if we've been too conservative, that may be another cause to raise that threshold a little bit.

So to answer your question a little bit, we haven't decided internally but there's possibility that it could be changed, but right now we haven't -- we don't have

the policy that says as soon as we hit that, you know, 20 or 30 whatever that threshold is, you know, that we'll break the OC-3 chain and add more capacity to the entire -- we don't know what we're going to do.

MR. NUTTALL: I guess one other comment I would make then is in the input into your planning process is let's not create an environment so that the whole game is to tie up as much CBR bandwidth as you can because it's not going to be available down the line. And so if it becomes first come first serve and there is a cap limit, one carrier could go out and tie everything up and really not fully be utilizing it because they might need it down the line and shut everybody else out.

MR. WALLACE: Yeah. I think somebody would be hard pressed to that because they'd have to -- I mean, you'd have to find all the -- you'd have to have paying customers out there or they'd have to be paying customers out there. That would be a potential that somebody could go out and do that but they'd have to have somebody at the end of the loop paying the bill, I would foresee. Otherwise that'd be an expensive proposition to just tie it up. It is possible.

MR. NUTTALL: It's amazing how creative people can get when they want to.

MR. WALLACE: You guys are really creative. You guys can be very creative.

MR. BOYER: Chris Boyer for SBC again. I would just propose that specific questions like that are really terms and conditions contractual type issues about how it would be offered, and I think when the letter goes out in March, those specific issues will be addressed on that subject at that time. So I think that right now we're still evaluating how it's going to be dealt with but, you know, first come first serve type issues, how exhaustive will be dealt with in terms of those will all be contractual issues that will come out with our generic offer notes.

MR. DARLING: There's two places -- Gary Darling with ASI. There are two places in the presentation for CBR plus UBR. We're really talking about a minimum bit rate in that case or are you talking about two services on the same loop?

MR. WALLACE: Two services on the same loop. Two PVCs on the same loop, different VPIs, VCIs at the customer location and at the OCD port. So you need CP that's capable of terminating two virtual circuits, and one of them has to be capable of terminating them understanding CBR. But it is two services on the same loop.

And to get back to that, the PROF FID, if you're familiar with that, that's specified when -- specified from the orders today specifies like the bandwidth of the entire -- kind of the entire loop. The CBR index FID, the new

one, will specify the bandwidth characteristics of just the little piece and then UBR gets whatever's left. In the same way -- it works exactly the same way I was showing for the entire OC-3 where CBR is guaranteed a portion and UBR gets whatever's left. It works the same way on the individual loop. The CBRI FID will guarantee a specific portion of that for the CBR traffic and UBR gets whatever's left. Question in the back.

MR. GENTRY: Darrell Gentry for [unintelligible] Communications. Is there any -- or do we --

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't hear you.

MR. GENTRY: Pricing for the CBR PVC.

MR. WALLACE: I'm going to defer that to Pete.

MR. WILCOX: That's really product in nature. I don't think at this point in time it is -- correct me if I'm wrong, other side of the table. It will be coming out shortly, okay, and obviously will be part of the contractual offering. So the answer right now quite frankly is not at this time.

MR. BOYER: I would say that it would be -- the rates, terms and conditions would all be part of the accessible letter that would go out.

MR. WALLACE: And I think something else

that we wanted to make clear is the next collaborative meeting which Bethaney is going to schedule before the end of this session, we plan to provide another update and hopefully can give more information about some of the specifics as we get closer to the March 8th date. Sometime in the mid-February range we plan on giving you another update very soon.

MR. GENTRY: Do you think it's only symmetric only initially?

MR. WALLACE: Initially symmetric only. If there's a -- an asymmetric offering that you're interested in, like I said, we'd love to hear more about particular protocols or applications that need to utilize CBR. Other questions? Heck of a deal. All right. That's all I've got. Back to Pete. I'll be around the rest of the day for questioning.

MR. WILCOX: That officially wraps up the morning part of our presentations or our scenario here for what we wanted to cover. Obviously there's time -- there's a little bit of extra time as folks are setting up lunch now, folks that didn't have enough during breakfast and I believe the food's going to be good.

Please take advantage of our availability. If there's things that you want to discuss, if there's anything that's on your mind from the morning, the open panel discussion for this afternoon you can bring it up there.

Catch one of us during lunch if you like. Let's make an agreement that we don't leave here with questions unasked or at least broached, all right. That is still the information exchange that gives us more to work on and you folks more to think about as we look forward.

MS. GENTRY: Can we ask some questions now and then if you want to defer them because they're going to be covered in other topics, advise us of that?

MR. WILCOX: So long as let's say it relates to the morning?

MS. GENTRY: Because I'm thinking this is kind of a technical morning and then if we have other things this afternoon, that's kind of a catchall.

MS. BEATA: I don't see any problem with that. I know that we're running ahead of schedule, which I just can't believe, so this might be a good time for us to run through some of the administrative things we need to do like schedule future meetings, talk about the calendar, talk about locations, etc. That'll get us a little bit closer to where we were on the schedule and then we'll have lunch and then we'll move into that open session. How is that? Is that okay? Bethaney, did you want to proceed with any of the admin issues you need to?

MS. PRICE: First we need to schedule monthly collaborative sessions for the rest of the quarter,

and I was thinking maybe February and I'm not sure where. Where are you guys going to be located through, what state or what region? So if anybody has any proposed dates, that would be great.

MS. GENTRY: Bethaney, talk more about what your intended purpose is for the February meeting and if we can get dates so we can back it into other meetings that we're having with SBC.

MS. PRICE: Okay. The February meeting is going to go ahead and cover the issues matrix that we have been going over, the monthly big stack of issues matrix to go over any answers/questions. I'm going to go ahead and try to locate a subject matter expert on the LoopQual as discussed in our last industry collaborative meeting to go over screen prints and other questions that you may have for LoopQual.

We also for one of the monthly meetings will try to get DTI representatives to go over the DTI tool again. And that should -- that could either be February or March. Either way it works out. I think that's about it. We'll go over CBR again, and I think that's about it. Probably try a quick trial and discussion about ten to 15 minutes to go over the status of the trial.

So the proposed dates I have for February were February 15th.

MS. GENTRY: There's a Kansas hearing.

MS. PRICE: Kansas hearing? How about the week of the 19th?

MS. GENTRY: Is the 19th a holiday?

MS. PRICE: Well, the week of the 19th.

MS. GENTRY: How about the 22nd?

MS. PRICE: The 22nd? February 22nd. Okay. And I'll send out an E-mail reminder with location information. March, do we want to keep the 22nd? Okay. Go ahead and keep March 22nd. And April we can either go the 19th or the 26th. April 19th.

And we're also going to have to talk about our next quarterly meeting which will be sometime April, May or June. I don't know what dates everyone will be available for another meeting.

MS. BEATA: And also location.

MS. PRICE: I'm sorry? And where. I know we did -- the last two we've had in Dallas. There was recommendation about rotating them around to Chicago or San Francisco. Does anybody have a preference?

MS. LOPEZ: California.

MS. CARTER: Chicago's right in the middle of the country.

MS. PRICE: How many hands for Chicago?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What month?

MS. PRICE: June or May. How many for San

Francisco? It's about half and half.

MS. GENTRY: One or the other, is that guaranteed?

MS. PRICE: I'm sorry?

MS. GENTRY: Is it your intent to have it in either Chicago or San Francisco?

MS. PRICE: Or Dallas, if people would like. But we would like to rotate for everyone to attend. So we could do Chicago the next time, San Francisco sometime in the summer. Would that be agreeable?

MS. GENTRY: . . . so we can start zeroing in on it?

MS. PRICE: How about the week of May 13th, that Thursday? I think it's the 16th, the 17th. May 17th.

MS. LOPEZ: Where are you saying that's at now?

MS. PRICE: Chicago. May 24th. It's right before the holiday.

MS. GENTRY: Is there a possibility for June or are you trying to do May?

MS. PRICE: We could do May or June.

MS. GENTRY: Is there a possibility of doing it like the 10th then or something earlier?

MS. PRICE: We can do it anytime. Is that

agreeable?

MS. CARTER: Bethaney, you'll be sending out the transcript for this meeting like you did the last time?

MS. PRICE: Yes. Transcript, copy of all the presentations and any other information that we need to distribute and reminder of the meetings.

MS. CARTER: Thank you.

MS. PRICE: We'll go ahead and try to keep around the 22nd to 19th for the monthly meetings through the year. Those can change and we'll address that every quarterly meeting. And that's all I have. So I think everything's ready in the back if you want to go ahead and break for lunch or if you have any other questions that you need to address.

(Lunch break was taken.)

STATE OF TEXAS *

COUNTY OF DALLAS *

I, Christy Russell, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Texas, hereby certify to the following:

That this transcript is a true record of the proceedings held at the Project Pronto CLEC Collaborative on January 25, 2001 at Three Bell Plaza, 308 S. Akard Street, Dallas, Texas 75202.

CERTIFIED TO on this, the _____ day of February, 2001.

_____

CHRISTY RUSSELL, Texas CSR 5459
Expiration Date: 12/31/2002
U.S LEGAL SUPPORT
900 Jackson Street, Suite B200
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 741-6001

Job#02-17950

EXHIBIT MAC-5

COVAD PROPOSED SPECIAL REQUEST LANGUAGE

1 AVAILABILITY OF FUTURE FEATURES AND FUNCTIONS

1.1. AMERITECH-ILLINOIS shall collaborate with CLECs to ensure that additional features and functions that are technically and economically feasible are introduced.

1.2. A feature and/or function shall be deemed "technically feasible" if such capability has been made commercially available by the manufacturer of the DSL-enabled NGDLC deployed by AMERITECH-ILLINOIS. and/or Such capability is made available at retail by the ILEC or its affiliates.

1.3. A feature and/or function shall be deemed "economically feasible" if the CLEC is willing to pay TELRIC-compliant rates based on the per-unit capacity cost associated with that feature and/or function (e.g., for the amount of bandwidth dedicated to or used by the CLEC).

1.4. Should the vendor of any DSL-enabled DLC, including NGDLC deployed in conjunction with Project Pronto, develop in the future, for use with such vendor's NGDLC equipment, a feature and/or function (such as other versions of xDSL or additional ATM QoS offerings) desired by CLEC, or should CLEC desire a higher grade ATM QoS than currently made available, CLEC may submit a request to SBC for such feature, function or ATM QoS. Requests for such capabilities shall fall into four separate categories, depending on the type of request. The categories are as follows: 1.) Special Request for a new feature and/or function that is not currently commercially available by the manufacturer (New Feature and/or Function Development), 2.) Special Request that involves a software upgrade only, (Software Only Upgrade) 3.) Special Request that requires a new type of line card to be installed at the remote terminal (Line Card), and 4.) Special Request for a feature and/or function that is commercially available from the manufacturer, but has not yet been tested and approved by SBC (Approval For Use).

2. SPECIAL REQUEST – NEW FEATURE AND/OR FUNCTION DEVELOPMENT

2.1. Should CLEC desire a specific feature and/or function not presently commercially available from the manufacturer of the DSL-enabled DLC, CLEC will follow the Special Request – New Feature And/Or Function Development Process outlined herein. This process is specifically designed to examine technical feasibility, formulate developmental processes, indicate pricing, and work collaboratively with the vendor to provide deployment timeframes for the unique feature and/or functionality being requested. If requested by CLEC, AMERITECH-ILLINOIS will hold a review meeting prior to the actual submission of the Special Request to discuss the specific arrangement with CLEC in an attempt to determine technical feasibility. Such meeting will be held within five (5) business days of CLEC's request.

2.2. CLEC will submit in writing to AMERITECH-ILLINOIS the Special Request Process Application, with appropriate operational narrative, drawings, technical references, location(s) for deployment, requested implementation date(s), and a non-binding forecasted quantity over a (36) month period. A $100 fee will accompany the Special Request application. This Application is available in the CLEC Handbook.

2.3. AMERITECH-ILLINOIS will acknowledge receipt of the Special Request Process Application within one (1) business day. Such acknowledgement will be sent to the CLEC via e-mail, as well as though U.S. Mail.

2.4. **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** shall provide a preliminary analysis no later than forty five (45) business days following CLEC submission of the Special Request Process Application. If **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** determines that further development is technically feasible, **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** will return to the CLEC an analysis with a price quote with indication of a cap on the anticipated developmental costs, based on the information provided by the CLEC. AMERITECH – ILLINOIS shall also provide CLEC with a developmental timeline detailing due dates for specific project milestones. If **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** believes that further development is not technically feasible, **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** will provide CLEC a detailed written explanation of the basis for its belief.

2.5. CLEC will notify **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** by written authorization whether to proceed with development within ten (10) business days from receiving the **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** analysis and price quote.

2.6. If CLEC requests to proceed with development, **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** shall work collaboratively with the vendor of the DSL-enabled DLC and will inform the CLEC of the prospective delivery date as soon as available. CLEC will be responsible for the TELRIC-based up front development costs incurred by **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** in response to any request for which the CLEC has requested **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** to proceed with development.

2.7. Should CLEC cancel the request after informing **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** that it wishes to proceed with development, cancellation charges will be applied, not to exceed the TELRIC-based development costs incurred by **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** up to and including the point of cancellation.

3. **SPECIAL REQUEST-SOFTWARE ONLY (E.G., G.LITE)**

3.1. Upon receipt of a Special Request Process Application from a CLEC as outlined above for a feature and/or function that only requires a software upgrade, **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** will make available the requested feature and/or function to the requesting CLEC, at the locations specified by CLEC (provided such locations are DSL-enabled locations), within thirty (30) calendar days of the receipt of CLEC's confirmation to proceed with the deployment of the requested feature and/or function.

if costs exist

3.2. Upon receipt of the initial CLEC Special Request Process Application for a feature and/or function that only requires a software upgrade, **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** will acknowledge receipt of such request within one (1) business day and will provide the CLEC with a price quote of the estimated TELRIC-based amount on a per-unit basis. Such quote shall include at a minimum the estimated price of the feature and/or function on both a monthly recurring and non-recurring basis, and shall be provided to CLEC within 10 business days of receipt of such request. If SBC has previously determined the cost for such offering, then the quote will be provided to CLEC within one (1) business day. Following this response, CLEC will be provided 10 business days to determine whether CLEC would like to proceed with deployment of the feature and/or function.

3.3. **AMERITECH – ILLINOIS** will perform the requested software upgrades within thirty (30) calendar days from the receipt of the CLEC's confirmation to proceed with the deployment of the requested feature and/or function.

4. **SPECIAL REQUEST – NEW TYPE OF LINE CARD (E.G., G.SHDSL)**

4.1. Upon receipt of a Special Request Process Application from a CLEC as outlined above for a feature and/or function that requires a new line card to be deployed in the DSL-enabled DLC, **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** will make available such a feature and/or function to the requesting

CLEC, at the locations specified by CLEC (provided such locations are DSL-enabled locations) within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of CLEC's confirmation to proceed with the deployment of the requested feature and/or function.

4.2. SBC shall follow its Unbundled Network Element Facility Modification and Construction Policy ("FMOD") Issue 4.1, released June 2001, when determining facility availability.

4.3. Upon receipt of the initial CLEC Special Request Process Application for a feature and/or function that requires the deployment of a new line card, **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** will acknowledge receipt of such request within one (1) business day and will provide the CLEC with a price quote of the estimated TELRIC-based amount on a per-unit basis. Such quote shall include at a minimum the estimated price of the feature and/or function on both a monthly recurring and non-recurring basis and shall be provided to CLEC within ten (10) business days of receipt of such request. If SBC has previously determined the cost for such offering, then the quote will be provided to CLEC within one (1) business day. Following this response, CLEC will be provided ten (10) business days to determine whether CLEC would like to proceed with deployment of the feature and/or function.

4.4. **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** will perform any necessary software and hardware upgrades within thirty (30) calendar days from the receipt of CLEC's confirmation to proceed with the deployment of the requested feature and/or function.

5. SPECIAL REQUEST – APPROVAL FOR USE ("AFU") PROCESS

5.1. If a feature and/or function that is commercially available from the manufacturer has not been tested by SBC, SBC, at its option, shall perform a field test to verify that the requested feature and/or function will work in the company's existing network. The AFU process will only be necessary for the first request submitted by any CLEC for a specific feature and/or function.

5.2. **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** will introduce the requested feature and/or function into the AFU process upon receipt of a CLEC response confirming its agreement to move forward with the feature and/or function. Following such confirmation, the AFU process will be completed within forty (40) business days. **AMERITECH-ILLINOIS** will make available the feature and/or function at the specified DSL-enabled RT sites no later than thirty (30) calendar days after the completion of the AFU Process for the requested feature and/or function.